



---

Review

Reviewed Work(s): Sophocle by Paul Masqueray

Review by: A. C. Pearson

Source: *The Classical Review*, Vol. 38, No. 7/8 (Nov. - Dec., 1924), pp. 198-200

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/700838>

Accessed: 01-02-2017 19:04 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



*Cambridge University Press, The Classical Association* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Review*

## SOPHOCLES.

*Sophocle.* Texte établi et traduit par PAUL MASQUERAY. Tome I. : Ajax, Antigone, Oedipe-Roi, Électre. Tome II. : Les Trachiniennes, Philoctète, Oedipe à Colone, Les Limiers. Two vols. Pp. xxxv + 266 = 532; 250 = 500. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1922, 1924. 18 fr. and 20 fr.

A USEFUL edition of Sophocles has been completed by M. Paul Masqueray in the well-known series of the Association Guillaume Budé. The present writer, who has recently edited a text of Sophocles in the series of Oxford Classical Texts, is gratified to find how often his constitution of the text agrees with that of M. Masqueray.

The principles upon which Sophocles should be edited are no longer open to serious doubt, and the true aspect of the matter would gradually have been perceived, even if the evidence of the papyri—unfortunately scanty as it directly relates to Sophocles—had been less decisive. In brief, they establish that readings hitherto credited to the ingenuity of the Byzantines were already in existence a thousand years or more earlier, and that consequently the authority of the *deteriores* upon which they rest is not entirely to be ignored. No doubt it is often true that the correction is deliberate and of such a kind that modern scholars would have detected the corruption without any serious difficulty, but much less is to be attributed to this source than is generally supposed. Thus in *O.T.* 827 the illogical order *ἐξέθρεψε καὶ ἐξέφυσε* is given by at least five MSS. It is generally regarded as a mere blunder, and is not noticed by M. Masqueray. But when we find that the same order appears in Pap. Oxy. 1369, there is good reason to suppose that the medieval scribes gave a correct representation of their immediate archetype in this instance, and that the occurrence of the logical order in LA should not influence us in favour of their reading unless it commends itself by intrinsic merit.

Thus it appears that a variant supported only by the authority of a late MS. is not necessarily an arbitrary in-

terpretation, but may be the remnant of a genuine tradition. However this may be, the variants in question, apart from such graphic errors as easily lend themselves to correction, are very few in number. The main authority on which our modern texts depend is that of the Laurentianus XXXII. 9 and the Parisinus 2712, and M. Masqueray rightly makes them the basis of his recension, with occasional mention of the later copies. In the list of sigla (I., p. xxxi) he selects for mention from amongst these latter only Parisinus 2884 and Laurentianus 152. The age of the last-named and certain peculiarities of reading may be regarded as warranting its selection, but if it is desired to present a complete record of the passages where one or other of these copies deserves mention, it will be found necessary, in view of our present ignorance, to specify at least forty. The independence of A as compared with L, denied by Dindorf and others in the nineteenth century, is assumed by M. Masqueray, and the evidence which he quotes on p. xx is adequate to prove it. On the other hand, he discusses in detail the question whether L and A are derived ultimately from the same archetype, and decides it with some hesitation in the affirmative. Yet he sometimes writes as if the question were the genuineness of the diverse readings rather than their derivation from the same source: thus he argues, much as Dindorf does, that in *Phil.* 220 the scribe of A deliberately introduced into a corrupt text the conjecture *ναυτίλω πλάτη*.

I regret that M. Masqueray has given fresh currency to the mistaken inferences that have been drawn from the absence of *Ant.* 1167 from the text of our MSS. Turnebus restored it from quotations by Athenaeus and Eustathius, and the latter adds that the verse is found in the *ἀκριβῆ ἀντίγραφα*. M. Masqueray infers that Athenaeus possessed a MS. better than ours, and implies that the same is true of Eustathius. It should be observed that the quotations are independent of each other, as the contexts show, and that Athenaeus, who probably derives from an anthology

on ἡδονή, gives no sign of being aware that the text from which he quotes is a corrected version. To suppose that Eustathius, who lived some 200 years later than the date of L, possessed copies outside the tradition of our MSS., is so improbable a hypothesis that it is amazing to find it suggested by Jebb, whom Masqueray follows. Once again,<sup>1</sup> therefore, it is necessary to point out that the ἀκριβῆ ἀντίγραφα were known not to Eustathius but to his ultimate source, which was earlier, one may guess, in view of the coincidence of Athenaeus, than the collection of Apion and Herodorus to which his text may be directly traced. M. Masqueray judged it unnecessary to repeat for Sophocles such a history of the tradition of the text as had been written for Aeschylus by M. Mazon, to which his readers are referred. Perhaps for this very reason he failed to see the solution which Eustathius' quotation requires.

In that part of his Introduction which treats of the text there are certain details which I hope that the editor will reconsider when a second edition is required. On p. xiii it is stated that the scholia contain references to Nonnus which prove them to be subsequent to the date of his poem; but the passages cited are by no means decisive. On p. xxii the statement that A has ναίων, L ἀνάσσω, requires amplification. L, as restored by the διορθωτής, has ναίων, and though it is probable that ἀνάσσω was originally written by the first hand, it was a mere blunder without significance. On pp. xxiv, xxv I think that Masqueray should not have hesitated to accept from the papyri ποτὲ βλέψασα in *El.* 995, and especially Μύσια in *Ai.* 699. The latter can be traced in the version of the scholia preserved by Suidas, and the appropriateness of the combination of Cretan with Phrygian dances is obvious (Strabo 466, etc.). *Ai.* 330 (p. xxvii<sub>4</sub>): the reading λόγους appears as a variant in Bodl. C. 89. The treatment of *O.T.* 943 f. is unsatisfactory as it stands, because it omits to take account of the variations of the *deteriores*. These show clearly that the reading of LA is only one of several methods

adopted to cure a metrical defect, and here, if anywhere, Byzantines other than Triclinius have been at work.

M. Masqueray's text is conservative, and he displays no inclination towards that itching for conjecture which prevailed in the last century. The limits within which conjecture should be confined are clearly stated, and the editor, who declares that he hardly ever resorts to it, shows much self-restraint by acting up to his principles. Nevertheless it is to be regretted that he should have proposed ἐκλάβη in *Ai.* 965. It should be mentioned that the *Ichneutae* is printed at the end of the second volume, and many will be glad to have it in a convenient form. Here also, where we might well have expected some fresh suggestions, the editor prefers to print a text selected from the restorations of his predecessors. The present reviewer certainly cannot complain that a considerable number of his own have been adopted.

The short introductions to the separate plays are admirably written, and deal with just those matters on which a student looks for information; and the literary appreciations of the dramatic motives are, as might be expected, clear and sensible. I am not competent to appraise the translation, which I have tested only here and there. I notice, however, that on p. 241 the words σε προσβιβῶ λόγῳ are wrongly rendered by 'je te ferai avancer.'

I proceed to notice points of detail taken from the *Ajax* and the *Philoctetes* where correction of the apparatus is needed:

*Ai.* 212 στέρξαξαν: a printer's error. 279 ἦκη: r. as well as Suid. 313 φανοίην: also in Ven. 467. 317: L did not write ἐξώμοξεν or οἰμογάς, although ω in the penultimate syllables is not clearly written. 371 is assigned to Tecmessa in two at least of the *recentiores*. 495: some cr. n. is required here, and at least the mention of ἀφείς. 597: ἀλίπλακτος is not peculiar to Γ, but is shared with H. Pal. and probably others. 626: φρενομόρως is a very strange word. Having regard to the constant confusion of β and μ at all times, I should have thought that Dindorf's φρενοβόρως was certain. 699: the

<sup>1</sup> See *C.Q.* XIII., p. 122.

n. suggests that Μύσια is a variant for Κνώσι', which of course is not intended. 747: the revised punctuation is unnecessary. πάρει belongs to Reiske. 799 and 896: the nn. are not quite accurate. 955: the article is omitted in Pal. 1023: ταῦθ' ἅπαντα, also in Pal. 1100: read λεών. 1118 f.: the n. is incomplete. 1352: schol. is a mistake for Eustath.

Phil. 23: Masqueray accepts Blaydes's τὸν αὐτόν, which has no probability. 163: Γ's τῇδε deserves mention. 434: σοῦ is superscribed in Ven. 468. 639:

ἀνῆ belongs to Lambinus, and is perhaps implicit in the schol. 648: ἐπι belongs to Auratus. 761: the n. is obscure. 782: ἀτελής is a misprint. 792: Wakefield's ἴκοιτ' deserved mention. 851: the reading ὅπως does not depend on conjecture. 950: σαυτοῦ is more idiomatic than σαντῶ, and should have been given the preference. 984: I hoped that Professor Housman had given τολμήσατε its quietus. 1028: something is wrong with the cr. n. here. 1094: 'Heat' is a misprint. 1243: τοῖς is in Lc (Laur. XXXII. 2).

A. C. PEARSON.

### VERGIL'S WONDERCHILD.

*Die Geburt des Kindes: Geschichte einer religiösen Idee.* By EDUARD NORDEN, One vol. Pp. 172. Leipzig: Teubner, 1924. 6s.

A NEW work on the Fourth Eclogue was about due, and it is a matter for congratulation that so competent a scholar as the author of *Antike Kunstprosa* and of the best commentary on the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid* yet written has taken the subject in hand. We find sound exegesis of the text, deep appreciation of the poem as such, and much interesting illustrative material ingeniously handled, in this admirable little book; and therefore the fact that many may, certainly the present reviewer does, find much to disagree with in the interpretations suggested, is of minor importance.

Norden, who has a prejudice in favour of Latin that will construe, accepts Quintilian's *qui* in v. 62, and with it the necessary emendation *parenti*. In 27, he brushes aside all attempts to make *legere* mean anything but what it plainly does mean—namely, 'read.' In 49, with good sense, the rhetorical form of the line, and the meaning of the whole context to aid him, he translates *Iouis incrementum*, *Nachwuchs Iuppiters*, and quotes abundance of parallels. His rendering of another much-misconstrued line, 16, is considered below.

His general interpretation is this. No particular child, born or to be born, of any actual contemporary is meant. The poem is, though not in the sense in which it was long believed to be, a

Messianic prophecy. The reign of Apollo-Helios has come—*i.e.*, the winter solstice is passed; we are in the middle of the Christmas season, in other words; and Epiphany, Jan. 6, the γενέθλιον Αἰῶνος, will come soon, bringing with it the new, golden *saeculum*, of which the *nascens puer* is the incarnation, or rather, with which he is identical, for such concepts as time are far less abstract to ancient religious thought than to philosophy, especially current modern philosophy. That Pollio entered upon his year of office between these dates—*i.e.*, on Jan. 1, B.C. 40—is the occasion of a most graceful compliment to him, and that is his sole connexion with the child or the prophecy. The child will be a sun-child, spirit-conceived, of divine parentage, born to rule the universe. He will be inspired with divine life (*deum uitam accipiet*), will meet gods and heroes face to face, and will be received by them as one of themselves (*uidebitur illis*; they will not turn away their faces from him as from an intruder; the pronoun is dative of agent, and not dependent on *mixtus* supplied from *mixtos*, as many have clumsily taken it). Once his rule is established, the Golden Age will come and abide. The poem ends with the prayer that the child will come quickly, at full time, and testify his divinity by smiling, like Zoroaster, in the first moments of his life (*incipere . . . risu cognoscere matrem*).

In support of this interpretation, with much of which I fully agree, Norden